REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 12. The subject matter of the amended claims is express and/or inherent in the specification, claims, and/or drawings as originally filed. No new matter is added by these amendments. Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application. Applicant appreciates Examiner's careful review of the present application.

Response to Arguments

On page 6 of the Office action, Examiner notes that "Applicant only argues limitations that follow an intended use phrase, is used to (for). Since these limitations have no patentable weight as discussed, Applicant's arguments filed July 24, 2008 have no merit." On page 7 of the Office action, Examiner further notes that "Applicant is encouraged to amend claims of the present application to adequately describe both the functional and structural limitations and not how the structure is to be utilized."

In response, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 12 to adequately describe both the functional and structural limitations of the present invention. Although this Response/Amendment is after a **FINAL Office Action**, Applicant's amendments are based on the suggestions of the Examiner and the amendment should be entered. These functional and structural limitations of amended claims should now be considered patentable.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Green et al. (US 6,041,310, hereinafter Green) in view of Brockman et al. (US 6,125,356, hereinafter Brockman).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 1-13 and allowance of claims 1-13. The following remarks herein are responsive to the rejections as understood.

With regard to claims 1-5:

Amended claim 1 recites in part:

> 'a budget module configured for **calculating payable fees relating to vehicles within the purview of a client by using one or more preset formulas** stored in the data storage, **and for generating one or more budget plans in a table form.**'

Applicant submits that neither Green nor Brockman, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-highlighted features, as set forth in amended claim 1.

Green teaches that a method and system for facilitating a transaction between a customer and an automobile dealership. The system includes a kiosk including an input/display terminal and a terminal processor for formulating a multilevel customer query of automobile inventory. The multilevel customer query searches a storage device containing automobile data and images and returns a selected inventory to the input/display terminal. The method includes a step of accessing customer data, customer queries and the selected inventory via a data server from a financing and insurance application to determine exact monthly payments for the lease/purchase of an automobile from the selected inventory (see the Abstract and column 5, lines 27-37 and column 6, lines 37-53 of Green).

Thus, according to Green, the monthly payments, including financing and insurance fees, for the lease/purchase of an automobile can be determined. Applicant acknowledges that the monthly payments of Green correspond to **payable fees** of amended claim 1. However, the claimed "**budget module**" in amended claim 1 can calculate payable fees relating to vehicles within the purview of a client *by using one or more preset formulas*. Green does not teach or suggest how to determine the monthly payments (**payable fees**). Green discloses that the monthly payments (**payable fees**)

should be manually determined by searching the selected inventory information. The presently claimed "**budget module**" in amended claim 1 can generate **one or more budget plans**. The "**one or more budget plans**" feature is disclosed in, at least paragraph [0042], the originally filed specification, and is not taught or suggested by Green. That is, the feature of "**budget module**" of amended claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Green. Green fails to teach or suggest the feature of "a budget module configured for **calculating payable fees relating to vehicles within the purview of a client by using one or more preset formulas** stored in the data storage, **and for generating one or more budget plans in a table form**," as recited in amended claim 1 of the present application.

Furthermore, amended claim 1 recites in part:

'a replication manager comprising a first data filter module, **the first data filter module configured for filtering information added in the database server, and configured for modifying existing information in the database server and the mobile terminals**;' [and]

'a domain manager configured for **managing domains**.'

Applicant submits that neither Green nor Brockman, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-highlighted features, as set forth in amended claim 1.

Green teaches that a data server is adapted to route a customer query from an input/display terminal to a storage device; to create a customer query containing parameters relating to a preferred automobile in a kiosk processor; to execute the customer query and create a selected inventory by determining whether a predetermined minimum number of inventory items meet the parameters and adding at least one additional item outside the parameters if fewer than the minimum number exist in a current inventory; and to display the selected inventory at the input/display terminal (see the Abstract, column 5, lines 27-37 and column 6, lines 37-53 of Green).

On page 3, the Office Action asserts that the data server of Green corresponds to **the application server** of amended claim 1, and is installed with one or more functional

programs for facilitating an automobile transaction between a customer and an automobile dealership. However, Applicant submits that Green does not teach or suggest that the data server has a function for **filtering information**, a function for **modifying existing information**, and a function for **managing domains**. The present claim 1 recites "the application server" that comprises *a first data filter module configured for filtering information added in the database server, and configured for modifying existing information in the database server and the mobile terminals,* and comprises *a domain manager used to manage domains.* That is, Green fails to teach or suggest the features of "a replication manager comprising a first data filter module, **the first data filter module configured for filtering information added in the database server, and configured for modifying existing information in the database server and the mobile terminals**" and the feature of "a domain manager configured for **managing domains**," as recited in amended claim 1 of the present application.

In addition, amended claim 1 recites in part:

'a link-switching module configured for **switching connection states as between the mobile terminal and the application server**, said connection states comprising a connected state and a disconnected state;' [and]

'a second data filter module configured for **filtering modification of data stored in the data storage, said modification performed when the mobile terminal is in the disconnected state**, and for sending data thus modified to the data synchronization module.'

Applicant submits that neither Green nor Brockman, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-highlighted features, as set forth in amended claim 1.

Green teaches an input/display terminal that is adapted to form a multilevel customer query and to display responses thereto, the terminal including a terminal processor, wherein the terminal processor is adapted to create a link between a customer and a salesperson assigned to the customer (see the Abstract, column 5, lines 27-37 and column 6, lines 37-53).

The Office Action asserts that the input/display terminal of Green corresponds to **each of the mobile terminals** of amended claim 1, and is installed with one or more functional programs for facilitating an automobile transaction for a customer. However, Applicant submits that Green does not teach or suggest that the input/display terminal has a function of **switching connection states between two devices** and has a function of **filtering modification of data.** Amended claim 1 recites "each of the mobile terminals" that comprises the link-switching module configured for **switching connection states as between the mobile terminal and the application server**, and comprises the second data filter module configured for **filtering modification of data stored in the data storage**. That is, Green fails to teach or suggest the feature of "a link-switching module configured for **switching connection states as between the mobile terminal and the application server**, said connection states comprising a connected state and a disconnected state," and the feature of "a second data filter module configured for **filtering modification of data stored in the data storage, said modification performed when the mobile terminal is in the disconnected state**, and for sending data thus modified to the data synchronization module," as recited in amended claim 1 of the present application.

Thus, Applicant asserts that Greens does not disclose the budget module, the replication server, input/display terminal or the other structures, as described above, having the same functional limitations as the system for assisting in selling vehicles of amended claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant asserts that Brockman also does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted structures and related functions. It is submitted that any combination of Green and Brockman does not teach or suggest the above-highlighted features either.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that neither Green nor Brockman, taken alone or in combination, teach or otherwise suggest the present invention, having the above-highlighted features, as set forth in amended claim 1. Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Green in view of

Brockman. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 1 are requested.

Claims 2-5 depend from amended independent claim 1, and thus include all of the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant believes that claims 2-5 should also be allowable.

With regard to claims 6-11:

Claim 6 recites in part:

> "**using one or more preset formulas to calculate payable fees in relation to the vehicle, and displaying a budget plan result generated in a table form on the mobile terminal.**"

Claim 6 is a method claim corresponding to the system for assisting in selling vehicles of amended claim 1. Referring to and incorporating herein the above-stated reasons regarding the patentability of amended claim 1, Applicant submits that neither Green nor Brockman, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the present invention having the above-described features as set forth in claim 6. That is, claim 6 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Green in view of Brockman. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of claim 6 are requested.

Claims 7-11 depend from independent claim 6, and thus include all of the limitations of independent claim 6. Therefore, Applicant believes that claims 7-11 should also be allowable.

With regard to claims 12-13:

Amended claim 12 recites in part:

> 'a replication manager comprising **a first data filter module, the first data filter module configured for filtering information added in the database server, and configured for modifying existing information in the database server and the mobile terminals;** and
>
> a domain manager configured for **managing domains;**'

'a link-switching module configured for **switching connection states as between the mobile terminal and the application server**, said connection states comprising a connected state and a disconnected state;' and

'a second data filter module configured for **filtering modification of data stored in the data storage, said modification performed when the mobile terminal is in the disconnected state**, and for sending data thus modified to the data synchronization module.'

Amended claim 12 is similar to the system for assisting in selling vehicles of amended claim 1 and includes all of the limitations of amended claim 1. Referring to and incorporating herein the above-stated reasons regarding the patentability of amended claim 1, Applicant submits that neither Green nor Brockman, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the present invention having the above-described features as set forth in amended claim 12. That is, amended claim 12 is unobvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Green in view of Brockman. Reconsideration and removal of the rejection and allowance of amended claim 12 are requested.

Claim 13 depends from amended independent claim 12, and thus includes all of the limitations of amended independent claim 12. Therefore, Applicant believes that claim 13 should also be allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the foregoing Amendment and Response place this application in condition for allowance. If Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, please call the undersigned at 714.626.1224.

Respectfully,

Chuang et al.

By   /Frank R. Niranjan/   Date: November 19, 2008

Frank R. Niranjan

Registration No.: 41,572

Please recognize the application with Customer No. 25,859

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel No.: (714) 626-1224

Fax No.: (714) 738-4649